

THE CRISIS.

Devoted to the Support of the Democratic Principles of Jefferson.

"Union, harmony, self-denial, concession---everything for the Cause, nothing for Men."

No. 14.

RICHMOND, SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 1840.

VOL. I.

TERMS.

THE CRISIS will be printed in quarto form, on a medium sheet, with new type. The price \$1—and no paper will be sent to any person, without payment in advance, postage paid. As nothing short of a very large and effective subscription can justify the continuation of the paper, the above terms will be strictly adhered to. We mean to make no debts at all. We assure all credit in this establishment, and insist upon the Cash System.

It is earnestly requested, that subscriptions for THE CRISIS be immediately sent to the Enquirer Office; though arrangements will be made to furnish subscribers with the back numbers as long as we have any on hand.

POLITICAL.

[From the Louisville (K.) Advertiser.]

EXTRACTS FROM THE ADDRESS

Of the Democratic Central Committee, to the People of Kentucky.

Fellow-citizens: Devotion to political principle is the characteristic which distinguishes the freeman from the subject or the serf. The principles which lie at the foundation of our free institutions will insure liberty and happiness to you and your posterity, if wisely and firmly sustained. Statesmen in a representative government are agents of the people; champions of cherished or established principles—organs through which the popular will is authoritatively expressed; and in the conflicts of parties they are necessarily prized in proportion to their fidelity and ability to illustrate, defend and carry out the views of those by whom they are supported. By trampling on their rights, England drove your fathers into rebellion, and the holy fervor with which they cherished the principles they contended for, sustained them through the war of the Revolution that established your freedom. In their Declaration of Independence they proclaimed that "governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed"—and, in the constitution under which you now live they endeavored to form a perfect Union between the States of the confederacy, to "secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity," and to establish a Government which would promote the general welfare and protect the States in the full enjoyment of their reserved rights. But the deliberations in Convention on the provisions in reference to the election of President and Vice President, proved that many of the members, unable to divest themselves of prejudices imbibed under a monarchy, were fearful the people could not be safely trusted to vote directly for high public officers. A College of Electors was therefore provided for, whose members were to vote according to their own discretion for two individuals, the person receiving the highest number, (being a majority,) to be President. The attempt of the Federal party to elect Burr over Jefferson produced an amendment of the Constitution, yet Electors were not dispensed with. From that period to the present, the people, confiding in their own ability to go into elections of President and Vice President without permitting themselves to be excited to the commission of excesses—having full confidence in their own powers of discrimination and capacity to select suitable men for those exalted stations—have pursued the policy of voting for Electors pledged to support particular candidates, and exacting from such candidates frequent, full and unequivocal avowals of their opinions and principles. In your congressional elections you invariably require candidates to avow their principles freely, and to respond to calls made on them for their sentiments on all important subjects. Even in elections for members of the General Assembly of the State, you have rigidly observed this republican rule, no doubt with a view to the selection of representatives who would serve as faithful organs of your feelings, wishes and principles. Indeed, of your candidates for the Legislature, you have required full avowals of both State and National politics—thus showing that you were unwilling to elect men who, as State Legislators, might even express opinions at war with your own.

While you observe this rigid policy in reference to candidates for the General Assembly; when you would feel insulted were you to be asked to elect a member of Congress, without being furnished with a frank and full avowal of his principles; after adhering 40 years—from the contest between Burr and Jefferson to the present period—to the manly and Republican policy of pledging Electors to vote your will, and requiring candidates for the Presidency to avow their principles—to show their hands like men—you are invoked to support a man, who says he can answer no inquiry from friend or foe on the subject of Abolition; a man, whose Con-

fidential Committee, (for it is now admitted he has one,) states that the "policy is, that the General make no further declaration of his principles for the public eye, whilst occupying his present position."

The time was when General Harrison would have deemed it degrading to hesitate to speak out like a Republican and a freeman; when he would have indignantly repelled the idea of concealing his political creed; when he was an open advocate of a right which none but monarchists will question—the right of Electors to call for the sentiments of a candidate for office. In a note addressed, September 16, 1832, to a paper then published in Cincinnati, (the Inquirer,) Gen. Harrison said:

"In your last paper you recommend to the candidates at the ensuing election, to publish their political creeds, that the electors may have a fair opportunity of choosing those whose sentiments best accord with their own. I HAVE EVER BELIEVED THAT EVERY ELECTOR HAS A RIGHT TO MAKE THIS CALL UPON THOSE WHO OFFER THEIR SERVICES TO THE PEOPLE, AND THAT THE CANDIDATES ARE BOUND TO ANSWER IT."

This is one of General Harrison's former expressions of opinion, and you will soon be able to decide what it is worth. It is more—a recognition of a right which no freeman will surrender; and the circumstances under which that recognition was made are now worthy of particular consideration. At home, surrounded by men who knew him well, a candidate for a seat in the General Assembly of the State—in constant intercourse with the people, and asking their suffrages every year or two—yet he did not pretend that it was to be presumed his sentiments were understood even by the voters of the county in which he lived. On the contrary, when invited to avow his sentiments for the information of the public, (in a single county,) he promptly pledged himself to comply with the request, admitted the right of a voter to make such a call, and that the CANDIDATES WERE "BOUND TO ANSWER IT." If under such circumstances Gen. Harrison was forced to admit the right of voters to interrogate and the duty of a candidate to answer, how can he now be justified for reversing his opinions? If when soliciting the votes of the people of one county he was "BOUND" to answer inquiries, why is he not bound to answer when seeking the votes of the people of twenty six States? If his sentiments were not understood by the people of his own county, how can they be supposed to be understood throughout a mighty nation? If on ordinary objects of State legislation a candidate is "BOUND" to answer calls for avowals of his sentiments, must not that duty be far more imperative when he is aspiring to the highest office in the Republic, and when questions are involved in the contest which menace the integrity of the Union? As these inquiries cannot be satisfactorily answered, we are driven to the conclusion, that Gen. Harrison is no longer what he was; that he has parted with the open and frank character of the soldier, and is made to personate the Machiavelian, surrounded, if not by a camp guard, by a Committee of Safety.

Since he proclaimed himself the "LEADER" of the Opposition,* his sentiments have been solicited on the disturbing question of Abolition, by citizens of North Carolina, Virginia, New York, Alabama, Illinois, &c. In two or three instances his Committee of Safety responded that, as the National Federal Convention had set the example [which has been followed by the State Conventions of that party generally,] the policy is, that the General make no further declaration of principles for the public eye; "and when the following letter was presented to him at his residence at North Bend, by two respectable citizens, he said: "nothing could induce him to answer such interrogatories, coming from either friends or foes."

LOUISVILLE, April 2, 1840.

Dear Sir:—The destinies of nations are occasionally influenced by factions at first disregarded—from whose labors, in the way of agitation, nothing is apprehended until they acquire an amount of power which cannot be controlled. The history of Abolitionism in the colonial possessions of England may be cited as an ample verification of these truths; and as it is now known that, between the opponents of the institutions of the Southern States of this Union, in Europe and America, a constant interchange of opinions is kept up, producing identity of sympathy and of purpose, the question

* See his letter in answer to an invitation to visit this city, published in the Louisville Gazette.

which has for some years disturbed the deliberations of Congress, and is beginning to be felt in the State and National elections, is manifestly too important to be overlooked by the friends of our glorious Union.

Concurring in the sentiments avowed on this subject by a majority of the House of Representatives of Kentucky, at the late session, we can say, in perfect sincerity, "that we view with indignation the attempts of a sect calling themselves Abolitionists, to disturb the amicable relations subsisting between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States of this Union, and would not by our votes aid in elevating to office any citizen allied to that ruthless faction of misguided fanatics, or coinciding in their opinions and plans."

The resolution, the body of which is quoted above, passed by a majority of nineteen; and it is proper to remark that the minority acted on two grounds in opposing it—1st, because it was not in their opinion sufficiently comprehensive—2d, because it stood connected with what they deemed irrelevant matter. Both parties, however, joined in denouncing the ruthless faction both agreed that it would be improper to elevate any citizen to office allied to that faction; and both united in declaring that their favorites, having nothing to conceal, would promptly and unequivocally respond to inquiries addressed to them, calculated to elicit a full expression of their respective sentiments on a subject so virtually important.

The undersigned believe, with a portion of those who discussed this question in the Legislature of Kentucky at its late session, that Statesmen are often controlled by circumstances—at times impelled onward by currents which are scarcely perceived until they are bearing downward on their turbulent bosoms every thing valuable. They moreover believe, Sir, that to the ruthless fanaticism of the Abolitionists, nothing can be successfully opposed save that love of the Union which the Father of his Country so feelingly inculcated in his Farewell Address, and which they have reason to hope is still sincerely cherished by the great mass of the two great political parties of the country. However widely we may differ on questions of policy, or as to the mode by which we would construe the Constitution, it is to be hoped the two parties at least unite in the opinion that the happiness, the strength, the glory of the nation, depend on the perpetuity of the Union, and that each will ever be prepared, through its most distinguished members, or highest public functionaries, to avow unqualified repugnance to a faction whose labors obviously tend "to disturb the amicable relations subsisting between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States." It was, therefore, matter of congratulation, when the friends of the present President proposed, in the House of Representatives of Kentucky, interrogatories on the subject of Abolitionism, to him and his distinguished competitor, that only the form, and not the substance of the proposition, was deemed objectionable by the Whig majority. They contended that such a call from such a source, might imply a doubt they could not entertain. For this reason, and this alone, Legislative interrogation was opposed; and when reminded that Mr. S. Williams had, in 1836, propounded questions on the same subject to one of the candidates for the Presidency; (probably at the suggestion of the Kentucky delegation then in Congress;) that his inquiries were fully answered, and that such inquiries would be again responded to, without hesitation—the Whig members of the House, with entire unanimity, pledged themselves that their favorite stood as ready to respond now as Mr. Van Buren did in 1836, and would reply as freely and frankly to any inquiries which might be made of him. We have therefore felt authorized to address you this letter; and to convince you that nothing unfair or discourteous is intended, we assure you a duplicate of the same has been transmitted to your distinguished competitor.

We maintain that the object of the cession of the District of Columbia "was to establish a seat of Government of the United States, and the grant in the Constitution, of exclusive legislation, must be understood, and should always be interpreted, as having relation to the objects of the cession." It was so understood by Maryland and Virginia, when they made the cession—and, for this reason, we believe, however broad may be the language of the grant, "there are objections to the Abolition of slavery in the District, by Congress, against the wishes of the slaveholding States, as imperative in their nature and obligation, in regulating the conduct of public men, as the most palpable want of constitutional power would be."

"We maintain that no power whatever was granted to the General Government with respect to slavery as it exists in the States, 'but that which relates to taxation and representation, and the power to restore fugitive slaves to their lawful owners'—that 'all other power in regard to the institution of slavery was retained exclusively by the States, to be exercised by them severally, according to their respective views of their own peculiar interests'—that 'the Constitution of the United States never would have been formed upon the principle of investing the General Government with authority to abolish the institution of slavery at its pleasure'—and that 'it never can be continued for a single day, if the exercise of such a power be assumed or usurped.'"

We shall therefore be pleased to learn, whether you concur in the view taken of the Abolitionists and the tendency of their action, in the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of Kentucky, at its late session?

Whether we have, in your opinion, correctly defined the powers of Congress in relation to the institution of slavery.

And whether, if chosen President, you will go into office determined to veto any bill that may be passed by Congress for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or in any one or more of the States?

With sentiments of high respect,

We are your obedient servants,

LEVI TYLER,

F. GEIGER,

D. MERIWETHER,

THOS. J. READ.

Democratic Central Committee of Ky.

The following note from Capt. Wm. Chambers and C. Van Buskirk, Esq., confirms the statement we have made—shows that General Harrison will not come out on Abolition, to oblige friends or foes:

LOUISVILLE, Ky., April 12, 1840.

Gentlemen—Early on the 10th of April instant, we called at the residence of Gen. Wm. H. Harrison, at North Bend, Ohio. When we entered the house we were informed the General was indisposed; but in something less than an hour he made his appearance. After the usual salutations were exchanged, one of the undersigned (Wm. Chambers) handed Gen. Harrison a letter addressed to him by the Democratic Central Committee of Kentucky, on the subject of Abolition. He received it, perused it—turned back and re-examined parts of it; expressed astonishment that his opinions, so repeatedly expressed, were not known to those gentlemen, and said that nothing could induce him to answer such interrogatories, coming either from friends or foes.

In a subsequent conversation, he referred to opinions heretofore expressed by him, but made no further response to the letter of the Central Committee.

Very respectfully, yours, &c.,

WM. CHAMBERS.

C. VAN BUSKIRK.

To the Democratic Central Committee of Ky.

A duplicate of the letter sent to General Harrison, was, as is stated in the body of it, also transmitted to the President, who, instead of taking shelter behind a committee, or "standing mute," replied as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 21st, 1840.

Gentlemen:—I have received your letter of the 2nd inst., and cheerfully comply with your request. You have inadvertently fallen into an error in supposing that the questions propounded to me by the Hon. Sherrod Williams, in 1836, embraced the subject of Abolition. My views and opinions in regard to it were, however, communicated to the people of the United States, in reply to a letter received in the same year, from Junius Amis, Esq., and other citizens of North Carolina, and also through other channels. Perceiving that I cannot do justice to your inquiries in the form which you have given to them, by a general reference to the answers I have heretofore given, I will repeat the substance of them:

First: That the relation of master and slave, is a matter which belongs exclusively to each State within its own boundary,—that Congress has no authority to interfere, in any respect whatever, with the emancipation of the slaves, or in the treatment of them in any of the States, and that any attempt to do so by the government or people of any other State, or by the General Government, would not only be unauthorized, but violate the spirit of the compromise, which lies at the basis of the Federal compact; and which is binding in honor and good faith on all who live under the protection of the Federal Constitution and participate in its benefits. This doctrine is in strict conformity to the principles embodied in a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the United States, in 1790, upon the report of a Committee, consisting almost entirely of Northern men.

Secondly: That conceding to Congress the abstract power of interfering with, or abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, under the broad grant of exclu-

sive legislation in all cases whatsoever over that District, there are, nevertheless, objections to the exercise of this power "against the wishes of the slaveholding States, as imperative in their nature and obligation, in regulating the conduct of public men, as the most palpable want of constitutional power would be."

Thirdly: That I desired the people of the United States then to understand, that if elected, I would go into the Presidential chair the inflexible and uncompromising opponent of any attempt on the part of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia against the wishes of the slaveholding States; and also with a determination equally inflexible to resist the slightest interference with the subject in the State where it exists.

The Twenty-fourth Congress, whose constitutional term expired at the moment when mine, as President, commenced, had avowed its belief that it was "extremely important and desirable that the agitation of the subject of slavery should be finally arrested for the purpose of restoring tranquillity to the public mind," and made it the basis of extensive and deliberate action in both Houses. In the House of Representatives a Committee (a majority of whom were from non-slaveholding States) reported, pursuant to instructions, two resolutions; the first was—"that Congress possess no constitutional power to interfere in any way with the institution of slavery in any of the States of the confederacy;" the second, "That Congress ought not to interfere in any way with slavery in the District of Columbia;" and a third, which was, in substance, that all papers and motions bearing upon the subject of slavery, should be laid upon the table without any further action thereon. They were accompanied by an elaborate and very able report, setting forth at large the reasons in favor of the opinions reported, and the course recommended by the Committee. The subject was finally discussed, considered and decided upon. The first resolution passed by a vote of 182 to 6—the second, of 132 to 45—and the third, of 117 to 68. In the Senate, the matter was considered upon a memorial from the Quarterly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, praying for the Abolition of domestic slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia. The subject was by that memorial presented in terms which offered no violence to the feelings of any class of citizens, and were best calculated to secure to the questions involved, a fair hearing and impartial decision. After several days' discussion, the prayer of the memorialists was rejected, by a vote of thirty-four to six.

An expression of similar opinions on the part of the Federal Executive, with an avowal of a determination to carry them out in his official acts, taken in connection with the known condition of the Congressional representation of the several States in regard to the slave question, would, it was thought, during the continuance of his constitutional term, prevent all agitation of the subject before Congress. The consequent certainty that nothing could for years at least be accomplished in that way, would, it was hoped, present sufficient inducements to all who were governed by conscientious motives, to desist from presenting their memorials, and leave all others without even a plausible pretence for continuing to agitate the subject in that form. No one could, it was supposed, believe, that our Southern brethren could be driven into a peaceable emancipation by the mere force of agitation—by appeals to the fears of the master and the passions of the slave—these might indeed, if persisted in, draw after them a servile, and probably a civil war, with a final dissolution of the Union. Attempts to expose our country to such fearful hazards for no other assignable motive than to harass the slaveholding States, or to subserve political purposes, would not, it was confidently believed, be endured much less countenanced, by the American people. Partaking largely in the general apprehension in regard to the fatal effects of this baleful agitation—having seen enough to satisfy me that no circumstance so directly and inevitably tended to impair the stability and interrupt the harmonious action of our complicated political system, as the existence of a doubt in the public mind concerning the action of the Federal Government upon this disturbing subject—sincerely anxious to promote the commendable design of Congress to restore tranquillity to a large and uniformly patriotic portion of the Union, and deeming the subject to be of sufficient importance to justify a departure from the ordinary usage of the Executive, I embraced the first public occasion to refer to the opinions I had expressed before my election, and to declare, formally, that no bill conflicting with those views could ever receive my constitutional sanction. Those opinions, and that determination, have been greatly strengthened by subsequent experience and reflection.

No one can doubt that the tendency of this species of agitation is, as your House of Representatives have very justly observed, to "disturb the amicable relations subsisting between the slaveholding and non slaveholding States of this Union," and it is not the least remarkable feature in its history, that the means employed are

precisely those best calculated to defeat the avowed objects of its authors. It is, to my mind, a most dangerous delusion to believe that the people of the slaveholding States are likely to be induced to change a condition of things over which, under the Constitution, they alone have the control, which they had no agency in producing, and for the consequences of which, whatever they may be, they cannot be justly held responsible—which is interwoven with their domestic relations and political institutions—by charging its existence upon them as a crime against God and man, against humanity and religion; or, that to awaken the apprehensions of the master by appeals to the passions of the slave, is the way to improve the condition of the latter. All candid and temperate observers must, on the contrary, admit that such are not the means by which salutary ends are produced—that furious denunciations and unmitigated reproaches, as little accord with Christian charity as with brotherly love, and are much more likely to produce stern resistance than quiet acquiescence. These truths are demonstrated in the results of the labors of the Abolitionists in the United States, which have hitherto been productive of nothing but evil, new restraint upon the colored race, vexation to the owner, and distraction to the councils of the nation. In reference, then, to such practices as those to which you have called my attention, I can, as a public man, find the path of duty only in one direction—that of undisguised opposition.

I am, gentlemen,

Very respectfully,

Your ob't servant,

M. VAN BUREN.

To Levi Tyler, Jacob Geiger, D. Meriwether, and Thos. J. Read, Esq., Committee, &c.

Fellow citizens, you have heard much of what one party has sneeringly termed the *non-committalism* of Mr. Van Buren, and what the same party has said and sung of the honesty, independence and decision of character of the available selected as its candidate for the Presidency—and, with the foregoing letters before you, we appeal to you to say whether you have ever met with a more striking refutation of censure in one instance, or praise in the other? You see the Hero dodging behind a Confidential Committee, or standing mute, and the reviled "Non-Committal"—the wily "Magician"—freely and fearlessly avowing his sentiments. One cannot confide in the intelligence and patriotism of his countrymen, the other fearlessly appeals to both. One dare not utter a sentiment "for the public eye" against the Abolitionists, the other proclaims them in the face of the nation, disturbers of the deliberations of Congress, and of the relations subsisting between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States. One desires and expects the aid of the fanatics, the other repudiates the "ruthless faction" and deems it unworthy of association with either of the great political parties. These facts strikingly illustrate the force of the remark, that "statesmen are often controlled by circumstances—at times impelled onward by currents which are scarcely perceived until they are bearing downward on their turbulent bosoms every thing valuable." Though the "former expressed opinions" of Gen. Harrison are contradictory, his friends did not dream that he would refuse to express repugnance to a sect of fanatics who are "disturbing the amicable relations subsisting between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States of this Union." Yet he has done so—he declares that he will neither answer friend nor foe on the vital question of Abolition. In thus disappointing and betraying his friends into the commission of errors which have subjected them to keen rebuke and withering ridicule, Gen. Harrison or his Confidential Committee could not have acted without motive. The force of this remark will be felt before we close this address.

When appealing to you, fellow-citizens, we trust we shall not forget what is due to you or ourselves. Believing the principles we profess are just, and such as freemen must cherish if they would continue to merit that proud title, our aim is to discuss this subject with candor and in a becoming temper. We know you too well to believe you can continue to sustain any party when your judgment may tell you it is unworthy or unsafe, or that you would knowingly support men who would hazard the tranquillity of the Union for office.—We feel that we are addressing the people of a State famed for its intelligence, chivalry and patriotism—a people who can only be influenced by truth, reason and elevated national considerations—who in their admiration of genius, may occasionally err, but never can be irretrievably estranged from the sacred principles of our free institutions. In the eyes of such a people "nothing is beautiful but truth," nothing persuasive with them but frank appeals to their pure love of country, nothing convincing but fair argument from unquestionable premises.

We shall, therefore, proceed to give you a brief but correct view of the expressed opinions of Gen. Harrison. In his Cheviot Speech of 1833, in his Vincennes Speech of 1835, and in his letter to Mr. Sloc of November 26, 1836, he expressed decided opposition to Abolition. In the latter, he denied the right of Con-

gress to interfere with slavery as it exists in the States, without their consent, or in the District of Columbia, without the consent of Maryland and Virginia. But, the letter to Mr. Sloo, which was published soon after the late Presidential election—which was so timely, accidentally or intentionally, as to have no influence on the politics of the country, and to attract very little attention—asserted the right of Congress, with the consent of the slaveholding States, to appropriate money to the emancipation of slaves, or the extirpation of slavery. In a previous and a longer letter to Mr. Berrien, the power to appropriate the national funds to the abolition of slavery, with the consent of the slaveholding States, was also asserted, and for that reason, it is supposed, the letter to Mr. Berrien was never published. Gen. Harrison also voted for the admission of Missouri into the Union, without restriction. To this extent he avowed and manifested opposition to Abolitionism.

Now for the other side of the picture. When the Missouri question was under discussion in Congress, February, 18, 1819, Gen. Harrison yielded the great point in controversy. "He assented to the expediency of establishing some such line of discrimination, [as the opponents of slavery contended for,] but for reasons which he explained at large, proposed a different one, as follows: That all that part of the present Territory of Missouri lying North of the line to be run due west from the mouth of the river Des Moines, to the territorial boundary of the United States, shall form a part of the Territory of Michigan; and the laws now in force in the said Territory, as well as the ordinance of Congress prohibiting slavery or involuntary servitude in said Territory of Michigan, shall be in force in that part of the Missouri Territory lying north of said east and west line." It has been well remarked, that "This amendment conceded the whole question of constitutional power." Mr. P. P. Barbour, in reply, argued, "that if the principle was wrong in itself, (and the question had been discussed on principle alone,) it ought not to be withheld from one part of the Territory and applied to another." If the rule was wrong at the 35th degree of latitude, it was equally so at the 40th. Gen. Harrison was in the Senate of Ohio the next year, (before the Missouri question was finally settled,) and in that body he assisted in maturing, and voted (Jan. 3, 1820) for the following preamble and resolution:

"Whereas, the existence of slavery in our country has ever been deemed a great moral and political evil, and in its tendency directly calculated to impair our national character, and materially affect our national happiness; and inasmuch as the extension of a slave population in the United States is fraught with the most fearful consequences to the permanency and durability of our Republican institutions; and whereas, the subject of the admission of slavery in the new State of Missouri is at this time before the Congress of the United States; therefore

"Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives be requested to use their utmost exertions and take every means to prevent the extension of slavery within the Territory of the United States, west of the Mississippi, and the new States to be formed within that Territory, which the Constitution and the treaties made under it will allow."

By voting for the foregoing preamble and resolution Gen. Harrison went as far as any other man, in or out of Congress, against the principle contended for by the slaveholding States, that Congress had no power to prohibit new States West of the Mississippi from holding slaves or recognizing them as property.

In 1822, General Harrison was again a candidate for Congress, and was charged with favoring slavery. In a circular he said:

"Fellow-citizens: Being called suddenly home to attend my sick family, I have but a moment to answer a few calumnies which are in circulation concerning me.

"I am accused of being friendly to slavery. From my earliest youth to the present moment, I have been the ardent friend of Human Liberty. At the age of eighteen, I BECAME A MEMBER OF AN ABOLITION SOCIETY, established at Richmond, the object of which was to ameliorate the condition of slaves, and procure their freedom by every legal means. My venerable friend, Judge Gatch, of Clermont county, was also a member of this Abolition Society, and has lately given me a certificate that I was one. THE OBLIGATIONS WHICH I THEN CAME UNDER, I HAVE FAITHFULLY PERFORMED."

"WM. HENRY HARRISON."

This was in 1822, after the Missouri Question was disposed of in Congress, and when Gen. Harrison was about fifty years of age. By the certificate of Judge Gatch, General Harrison proved himself an Abolitionist. In 1822 he evidently gloried in the name, and claimed credit for having continued to perform the obligations under which he came when he joined the Abolition Society. At the same time he remarked: "I have been the means of liberating many slaves, but never placed one in bondage." In his Cheviot speech, delivered July 4, 1833, General Harrison said:

"Should I be asked if there is no way by which the General Government can aid the cause of emancipation, I answer that it has long been an object near my heart to see the whole of its surplus revenue appropriated to that object. With the sanction of the States holding the slaves, there appears to me to be no constitutional objection to its being thus applied, embracing not only the colonization of those that may be otherwise freed, but the purchase of the freedom of others. By a zealous prosecution of a plan formed upon that basis, we might look forward to a day not very distant, when a North American sun would not look down upon a slave."

What is this but advocating the abolition of slavery? In 1822, Gen. H. referred to slavery as a blot on our national character, and was opposed to the extension of it within the new States to be formed west of the Mississippi. Two years afterwards he referred to a charge that he was friendly to slavery as a calumny—when he was fifty years old, he proclaimed and proved himself an Abolitionist—boasted that he had kept the vows he took when he joined the Society, and had been the means of liberating many slaves. And, as late as 1833, emancipation was "an object near his heart"—he was for appropriating the whole surplus revenue to that object—and looked forward "to a day not very distant, when a North American sun would not look down upon a slave"—when the scheme of Abolition would be fully consummated. What, but this, are the Tappans, the Garrison and Slades contending for? They proclaim slavery a moral and political evil, and so does Harrison. They assert that slavery impairs our national character, and so does Harrison. They are looking forward, and hoping the day may soon arrive "when a North American sun will not look down upon a slave," and so does Harrison. The Tappans and Garrison would forthwith liberate three millions of slaves without compensating their owners; but less daring Abolitionists propose to purchase the slaves with the funds of the General Government. Both aim at one object, the complete Abolition of Slavery in the United States; and the difference between the two classes of Abolitionists is not so great as may be imagined. Perhaps those who propose direct robbery, though more daring, are not so dangerous as their more discreet and wary associates. One part of the "ruthless faction" propose nothing short of force, the other would tempt you with money to consent to the demolition of the Constitutional barriers on which the security of your property and the safety of your wives and daughters depend. The Parliament of England, considered Omnipotent by the subjects of that realm, when driven by fanaticism to abolish slavery in its West India possessions, pursued the policy of purchasing. When it resolved to abolish what Gen. Harrison terms "a great moral and political evil," it professed a determination to pay a fair equivalent for the private property it was about to wrest from the colonists—but the same influence which forced the Government to liberate the slaves, controlled the appropriations to the colonists, and, by undervaluing the slaves, robbed the owners of four-fifths of the value of them. Under no circumstances that could possibly occur, were you to consent to violate the Federal Constitution and to sell your slaves to the General Government, you would be yielding up not only nine-tenths of the value of that description of property, but the protection which you now rightfully claim under the Constitution, and the influence which, as yet, enables you to counteract the ruthless spirit of the Abolitionists. To admit that Congress may usurp power to interfere with slavery as it exists in the States, would be giving up all—not only the value of the slaves, but your right to hold them, and the compromise by which three-fifths of them are represented in the popular branch of Congress. Yield assent to the policy so often recommended by General Harrison, if you are disposed to admit that the power of Congress is unlimited, and to place yourselves under the guardianship and care of Abolitionists; but if you would preserve your rights, defend the Constitution and perpetuate the Union—the path of duty, for you, can only be formed "in one direction—that of undisguised opposition," not only to those who would rob you openly, but to those who would tempt you with money to violate the Constitution and surrender your slaves at such prices as the Abolitionists may in their mercy, think proper to allow you.

Without reference to any thing more than General Harrison's former expressions of opinion, you have abundant cause to doubt his orthodoxy on the momentous subject of Abolition. If he voted against restricting Missouri, he yielded the principle for which the friends of Missouri contended, by assenting to a proposition to prohibit slavery north of a line running due

west from the mouth of the river Des Moines to the territorial boundary of the U. S.; and he subsequently voted in the Senate of Ohio, for a resolution requesting the delegation of that State to vote for the restriction on Missouri, to prevent the spread of what he termed "a great moral and political evil." If he has denounced Abolitionism, and denied the right of Congress to interfere with slavery—he has invariably declared his hostility to slavery, affirmed the right of Congress, with the consent of the slaveholding States, to purchase all the negroes in the country and manumit them, and proved himself an Abolitionist. Opinions so opposite and conduct so inconsistent cannot be reconciled. That the Abolitionists have found in the expressed opinions of the General, satisfactory evidence to them, that he is with them, if he is not still a member of an Abolition Society, cannot be doubted by such of you as have closely observed the political occurrences of the last twelve months.

The speech delivered by Mr. Clay in the Senate, Feb. 7, 1839, caused the Abolitionists to mark him, and cast about for a candidate whose feelings were more congenial to their own.

Throughout the country Abolitionists united in denouncing Mr. Clay, and in the resolve, that his anti-Abolition speech should be a death-blow to him and a manifestation of a fixed purpose to enforce that resolve was seen in the State Convention of Pennsylvania, composed of Abolitionists and Anti-Masons. Several weeks before the time fixed for holding the Whig Convention, the Abolition Convention had finished its labors, by an unconditional nomination of General Harrison; and, when professing great anxiety to harmonize with the Whigs, very significantly informed them, that the desired concert could only be insured by the selection of Gen. Harrison as the candidate of the Opposition. The Whig State Convention subsequently assembled, but it did not dare to murmur at the decree of the Abolitionists and Anti-Masons—Stevens, Ritter, Burrows, Penrose, &c. Next you detected the Abolition and Anti-Masonic State Central Committee of New York, scattering secret letters and Circulars throughout the non-slaveholding State—declaring that Mr. Clay could not, by any possibility, get the vote of New York or New England—that the great point was "to have the public voice indicate a preference" to prevent fatal mistakes at Harrisburg. The Circular said:

"Our party leaders want sagacity, or, as I prefer styling it, philosophy." "Superior or splendid talents, or exalted claims, are not the questions to be considered." "If Mr. Clay runs," "he will meet with opposition from old party antagonists." "The Jackson men will oppose him. The Abolitionists generally will oppose him. The violent Anti-Masons will oppose him. The Irishmen, who have already denounced him for his attack on O'Connell, will oppose him. The enemies of the U. S. Bank will oppose him. The Western Squatters will oppose him. The Southern State Rights men will oppose him."

"It seems," "some men must have taken leave of their senses, to advocate any candidate against whom any portion of this opposition may be brought."

"Our letters from the Western counties," [where Abolitionism and Anti-Masonry have long been in the ascendant,] "assure us that the Delegates to the National Convention will generally be Harrison men, and such they will be from this vicinity."

Thus the New York Abolitionists and Anti-Masons co-operated with the Abolitionists of Pennsylvania, in favor of Harrison and against Mr. Clay. It was urged that the Federalists had no chance to succeed, if opposed by any one of the fragments of the Opposition; that Mr. Clay was especially obnoxious to the people of the western part of New York, where the Abolitionists are five times as numerous as in any other quarter of the State. You have in these declarations clear proof that the Delegates from New York and Pennsylvania in the Whig National Convention were influenced by the Abolitionists; and we now present to your serious consideration a brief but authentic account of the doings of the Whig National Convention:

First Ballot for Henry Clay.

Rhode Island,	4
Delaware,	3
Maryland,	10
Virginia,	23
North Carolina,	15
Alabama,	7
Louisiana,	5
Mississippi,	4
Kentucky,	15
Missouri,	4
Illinois,	5
Connecticut,	8
	103

For Winfield Scott.

New York,	42
Vermont,	7
New Jersey,	8
	57

For Wm. Henry Harrison.

Maine,	10
Massachusetts,	14
New Hampshire,	7
Michigan,	3
Pennsylvania,	30
Ohio,	21
Indiana,	9
	94

The second ballot was the same. On the third ballot, Connecticut and Michigan changed their votes to Gen. Scott, making his vote 63, Harrison's 91, Clay's 95. The fourth ballot was the same.—On the fifth ballot, New York, Illinois, Vermont, and Michigan, gave their votes to Gen. Harrison, which made his vote 148, which was a majority of the whole electoral vote of the Union. Connecticut and New Jersey gave their votes to Gen. Scott.—The others, 30 in number, were for Mr. Clay.

Gen. Harrison was therefore nominated by the Delegates from Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, New York, Illinois and Vermont—by ten non-slaveholding States, and only two of that number decidedly opposed to the Democratic Party—we mean Massachusetts and Vermont.

"Show me the company a man keeps and I will tell you what he is." This maxim is fully applicable to Gen. Harrison. He is emphatically the candidate of the Abolitionists—is their favorite; and they boast of his nomination as a triumph. The great organ of the "ruthless faction" in New York, the *Evening Post*, said:

"Well, the agony is over, and Henry Clay is—laid upon the shelf. And a man of ordinary intelligence can doubt or deny that it is the anti-slavery feeling of the North which has done it, in connection with his own ostentatious and infamous pro-slavery demonstrations in Congress. Praise to God for a great anti-slavery victory. A man of high talents, of great distinction, of long political services, of boundless personal popularity, has been openly rejected for the Presidency of this great republic, on account of his devotion to slavery. Set up a monument of progress there. Let the winds tell the tale—let the slaveholders hear the news—let foreign nations hear it—let O'Connell hear it—let the slaves hear it—A slaveholder is incapacitated for the Presidency of the United States. The reign of slaveocracy is hastening to a close. The rejection of Henry Clay and the nomination of William Henry Harrison, by the Whig Convention, taken in connection with all the circumstances, is one of the heaviest blows that the monster slavery has received in this country."

Indeed the Abolitionists every where proclaim the nomination of Gen. Harrison a triumph over the slaveholding States. In Cincinnati this boast has been made again and again, in an influential paper published within a few hundred yards of the office of Gen. Harrison, and he tacitly admits that the Abolitionists have reason to congratulate themselves on the concessions made to their influence in the Harrisburg Convention. And this is not all. The Whig papers at Cincinnati hear the shouts of the Abolitionists without hazarding a remark upon the subject; hear the nomination of Harrison pronounced "one of the heaviest blows that the monster slavery has ever received in this country," without daring to deny the assertion. It is thus Gen. Harrison's neighbors, who must understand his sentiments, act on the vital subject of Abolition. They are as non-committal as his Confidential Committee, and nearly as firmly resolved to stand mute, when questioned, as the General is himself.

But, strong as the "expressed opinion" of General Harrison is against slavery—distinctly as they show settled hostility to the institutions and rights of the South—the conduct of himself and friends is still more convincing. "Acts speak louder than words." He has united the Abolitionists in his favor. They exult and impudently offer praise to God for the great anti-slavery victory achieved in his nomination over Mr. Clay—refer to the event as proof of their onward progress, and as an indication "that no slaveholder will ever again be permitted to fill the Presidential office in this Republic." They understand General Harrison, and he understands them, as is demonstrated by his manifest determination to continue to merit their confidence and support. What but congeniality of feeling with, or a sense of obligation to the Abolitionists, can restrain General Harrison from taking as firm a stand against the "ruthless faction" as Mr. Clay or Mr. Van Buren?

Called on a few months since by the Oswego Union Association, to say whether he would, if elected, be in favor of receiving and referring petitions presented to Congress for the immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and to express his sentiments in relation to a Bank of the U. S. and a General Bankrupt Law—his Confidential Committee, under date of Feb. 23, 1840, responded thus:

"As from his Confidential Committee, you will look upon this response; and if the policy observed by the

Committee should not meet with your approbation, you will attribute the error rather to ourselves and his immediate advisers than Gen. Harrison. That policy is, that the General make no further declaration of his principles, for the public eye, whilst occupying his present position.

But, you have more to condemn than non-committalism on the part of the Committee who hold the General in surveillance. He has been appealed to in vain, for his sentiments on Abolition, by gentlemen of Virginia, Illinois, Alabama, North Carolina and New York; and when presented with the letter addressed to him and Mr. Van Buren, which the latter has so promptly and satisfactorily answered, Gen. Harrison declared that "nothing could induce him to answer such interrogatories, coming either from friends or foes." His mouth is sealed; he dare not offend the "ruthless faction" whose movements are disturbing the amicable relations subsisting between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States, and producing distraction in the councils of the nation.

Col. Johnson, Mr. Clay and Mr. Van Buren, speak out like friends of the Union against the Abolitionists, but General Harrison dare not. And why?—he owes his nomination to them, is dependant on them, and is now under the guardianship of a Committee composed of Anti-Slavery men, who abhor the doctrines avowed in Mr. Clay's speech against Abolition. General Harrison's mouth is sealed, else he could have redeemed the pledge given in good faith by his friends in the H. of Representatives of this State. Of the nature of that pledge and the circumstances under which it was given, he has been sufficiently informed, as you will perceive by recurring to the letter addressed to him from this place—yet he dare not speak out—he shrinks from an avowal of his principles—and timidly or basely fails to redeem the pledged word of zealous and highly influential friends. Can conduct so unfeeling and unmanly be accounted for on any other hypothesis than this:—that the Abolitionists knew their man, and did not groundlessly claim his nomination over Mr. Clay, as "one of the heaviest blows that the monster slavery has ever received in this country?"—that the fanatics were right when they ejaculated: "Praise to God for a great anti-slavery victory?"

If the correspondence of his Confidential Committee with the Oswego Association astounded many of his wisest and best friends; if, from its ludicrous and humiliating character, it struck thousands that it was a clumsy hoax; if an intelligent Whig member of Congress from Ohio, Mr. Mason, indignantly pronounced it a forgery, when it was referred to in debate—believing it was impossible that a candidate for President should have refused to avow his sentiments on important questions—how deeply mortified must his Kentucky friends be, when they learn that, on being invited, at their instance, to redeem the pledge they gave in his behalf, he remains mute, and declares that he cannot be induced to avow his sentiments on the alarming subject of Abolition? Can they do less than admit that they have been deceived and disappointed in the man? Will it be pretended that Gen. Harrison has not, by his conduct, deliberately and unfeelingly stamped the solemn pledge they gave as a falsity? Will they, under these circumstances, continue to support him? Can they do so without a surrender of self-respect, or without admitting they are, in their political action, alike regardless of principle, the rights of the people and the safety of the Union?

Do you believe, fellow-citizens, that Mr. Clay meant to alarm and deceive you, when he delivered his speech against the fanatics—when he told you Abolition should no longer be regarded as an imaginary danger; that it had appealed to the ballot-box—had made its cause political—was arraying the non-slaveholding against the slaveholding States, threatening servile and civil war, and the overthrow of the Government established by your Revolutionary sires? On this vital question Mr. Clay concurs in opinion with the most distinguished of his political opponents—and a few facts will convince you that Mr. Clay only discharged a solemn duty when he warned you of your danger. In a late *Philanthropist*, a paper printed almost under the nose of Gen. Harrison, and advocating his election, the following language is used:

"The present Administration, it is generally conceded, is essentially Southern in its principles and policy. It is distinguished by its devotion to the foreign and domestic interests of slavery, perhaps more than by any other feature. The protection of slave labor seems to be its controlling principle. True, the free-men of the North and West number more than twice as many as those of the South, but they are supposed to have no peculiar interests; or the protection of their free labor is a minor consideration. The Aristocrats of the South give law to the Government, and Mr. Van Buren is their vassal Executive. Where is the American that does not blush, when he calls to mind with what cool audacity the Minister of our free Republic at London lately vindicated the right of holding human beings as property, and with what dishonorable pertinacity he demanded and re-demanded compensation

for slave property from the Court of St. James. Our Government advocating, and the British monarchy repudiating the pretension of a right to hold men as brutes!

"Mr. Van Buren is in subjection to the South. His cabinet is a slaveholding cabinet. The spirit of slavery there reigns supreme."

The friends of Harrison are thus striving to array the free States against the South. The Administration is pronounced Southern in principle, devoted to slavery and the protection of slave labor, in preference to the free labor of the non-slaveholding States. Mr. Van Buren is called the vassal Executive—his Cabinet is denounced as one in which "the spirit of slavery reigns supreme"—our Government is condemned for demanding pay for slaves driven in a storm on one of the British islands and improperly liberated by British authority, and the Court of St. James is applauded for "repudiating the pretension of a right to hold men as brutes."

In an Abolition Address lately published in New York by Arthur Tappan & Co. the votes are stated by which the resolutions were adopted, in the House of Representatives of the United States against considering Abolition petitions. The Address says:

"The votes from the free States in favor of these several gags, by Northern *serviles*, were, for Pinckney's 62, Patton's 52, Atherton's 49, and Johnston's 28—and of these last *serviles*, there was but one Whig and friend of Harrison, viz: Geo. H. Proffit of Indiana."

You here see how Northern Democrats, called *serviles*, are falling under the blows of the "ruthless faction." Five years ago sixty-two Northern Democrats stood shoulder to shoulder with the South, and Pinckney's resolutions passed by a majority of about two to one; three years since Patton's resolutions passed by a majority of forty-nine; Atherton's passed by a smaller majority; and at the present session, Johnston's passed by a majority of only six votes. As Abolitionists succeeded in "making their cause political" and "carrying their principles to the ballot box," you see the friends of the South regularly falling off in numbers in the popular branch of Congress. From a majority of two to one, they are reduced to a majority of six. One more electioneering campaign in the North, unless the progress of the Abolitionists be arrested, will break down a sufficient number of what they term Northern *serviles*, to throw the friends of the institution of slavery into a hopeless minority in the House of Representatives of the nation. Then, with a President who would not dare to avow a sentiment against the "ruthless faction"—or with a President indebted to that faction for his elevation, what could the South reasonably calculate on, but the liberation of their slaves, or a dissolution of the Union, to be followed by a civil war, leading to all the direful consequences predicted by Mr. Clay and other distinguished men?

Do not the facts we have stated convince you that "Abolition is no longer to be regarded as an imaginary danger?" Do they not tell you that, if you now desert your Northern friends, you cannot blame them if they refuse to do battle for you hereafter? Do they not admonish you that the safety of the Union is involved in the present contest, and that, instead of listening with composure to senseless and undignified hurrahs for hard cider and log cabins, you should prepare for the momentous struggle, and endeavor to prove yourselves equal to the crisis, by adopting the best course for the vindication of your rights and the preservation of the tranquillity of the Republic?

We but repeat facts familiar to the reading portion of community, when we remind you that in all the Legislatures of the free States in which, in the last four or five years, the Opposition have had majorities, resolutions have been passed, under pretence of defending the right of petition, affirming the right of Abolitionists to be heard in Congress, and necessarily encouraging the baleful agitation of the disturbing question; that in Congress the champions of the Abolitionists are among the most virulent of the Opposition; that the same party was controlled in its National Convention held at Harrisburg, by the "ruthless faction," and therefore that Convention did not dare to make a general avowal of principles; and that, at a Convention held a few days since at Baltimore, said to have been composed of twenty thousand young men, embracing such characters as Webster, Clay, Southard, Preston, Wise, Graves, &c., the policy of non-committalism was adhered to—the right of the people to understand the principles of men seeking their support, not only defied, but ridiculed, by the introduction of log cabin pageants, and flags exhibiting various facious devices, but none displaying the glorious stripes and stars under which patriots are ever ready to rally. These circumstances, connected with the positive refusal of Gen. Harrison to make any further declaration of principles for the public eye, show that the Opposition "love darkness rather than light," and have objects in view which they know you would not sanction.

LEVY TYLER,
T. J. READ,
D. MERIWETHER, } Committee.
P. GEIGER,
S. PENN, Jr.,

Louisville, May 16th, 1840.

(From the *Murfreesborough Weekly Times*.)
DIALOGUES OF THE DAY.

Whig Overseer with a bundle of Newspapers.

Well, Mr. A., I suppose you are satisfied now, that there is no use trying any longer—we are certain to beat you.

Mr. A. I never knew a time yet, when you were not certain of that; but you have always been defeated.

OVERSEER. Ah! but things wear a different aspect now. The country has become dissatisfied with the present Administration, and it will go down.

A. You mean, that the office-hunters and the Bank nobility have become dissatisfied. They always were so; and it is good evidence to me, that Mr. Van Buren's policy is right, when I see them foremost in the opposition, as they were against Jefferson and Jackson.

O. We cannot do without a Bank, and I would not be in the Opposition, if I thought we could get along without a National Bank.

Mr. A. Why, then, were you so anxious to elect Judge White, who declared a National Bank to be both unconstitutional and inexpedient?

O. Hem, oh, hem. The Bank is not absolutely—that is, the main vital question was the Sub-Treasury, and Judge White was opposed to that, you know.

Mr. A. Why, then, has your party elected for Speaker of Congress, an anti-bank man, who was a lead ing friend of the Sub-Treasury? You know you crowed over that.

O. Hum! he was a good Whig.

Mr. A. Yes, any body is a good Whig, who will help to put down the Administration, and help you to an office. But the people, as well as I remember, have always preferred principles to men.

O. Do you pretend to say, that the Whigs have no principles?

Mr. A. By no means. They have almost as many principles as there are Whigs. In New York, Vermont, Ohio, &c., they are for Abolition. In the South, they are Anti-Abolition. In Massachusetts and the North they are for a Tariff. In Tennessee and the South, they say they are opposed to a Tariff. In one section, they are for Internal Improvements by Congress; in another against it. In one section, they are for a Bank—in another, against it. In short, they make their principles to suit whatever they suppose to be the prevailing sentiment of a particular section. Nobody can tell what a Whig Administration would do, though we would have good reason to fear the worst measures.

O. You are the most prejudiced and bitter party man I have met with in my laborious round for some time. You won't reason. The country is going to ruin, and you shut your eyes. You have not given the first reason, why Gen. Harrison should not be elected.

Mr. A. Do you deny any thing I have said? If you do, I can bring the proof. Can you give one good reason why Harrison should be elected? And as to reason, one hardly knows what the Whigs wish to reason about. If your party would let us know its principles, we might come to the point. The principal arguments I have heard in favor of Harrison are, that somebody said he lives in a log cabin and drinks hard cider, and that he never stole any thing.

O. You fly off from the question. Don't you see that the country is ruined, and nothing can save us but a change of rulers? Can it be possible that you intend to support Van Buren, when you are compelled to sell your cotton at 6 and 7 cents?

Mr. A. The frost, too, killed my peaches the other night—Must I oppose Van Buren for that? I deposited some specie in Bank, and it has closed doors and refuses me a dollar—Must I oppose Van Buren for that also? Pray, Sir, what has politics to do with the price of cotton? Don't you know, that the British market regulates the price of cotton? And what with planters holding on for better prices, and your Whig banks keeping our money locked up, and your Whig politicians spending large sums for party newspapers, betting funds, &c., money is now somewhat scarce. You must save that sort of talk, Sir, for somebody more gullible.

O. Now, Mr. A., I address you as an intelligent man. I don't resort to the pitiful manoeuvres that some do, and I put it to you as you love your country, to go for Harrison, who will give us a Bank.

Mr. A. How do you know Harrison is for a Bank?—Of all that I ever saw from Harrison's pen, he declares a National Bank to be unconstitutional. Therefore, if a Bank is all that prevents you from supporting Van Buren, you ought to join him at once, and restore peace and quit this trade of politics.

O. Well, if we cannot get a Bank, there is something to be gained by putting out Mr. Van Buren.

Mr. A. Yes; the offices—that's the eyesore Mordecai is sitting at the King's gate. But you are deluding yourself and others, and you are deluded. Mr. Van Buren will be re-elected by an increased majority. You and your leaders go here for a Bank, because you think it is popular. Mr. Rives and his dupes go against a Bank in Virginia, because they believe it is unpopular—and so you go. Your Whig system of paper medicine eats up the vitals of honest labor. Speculation is encouraged and bankruptcy ensues. You create a morbid appetite for sudden wealth, and then ask to be put

in power by promising to satisfy it. Your paper currency causes all the distress, and then you want another paper factory to relieve the distress.

O. You are getting outrageous.—You cannot deny, that none of these difficulties existed under the National Bank.

Mr. A. Deny it! Why, we suffered severer and longer pecuniary distresses under that Bank; and, if you will step into my house, I will prove it to you by the testimony of Clay, and of Webster, and of Adams; some of your own modern Whig stars. You and I both used to call them Federalists: but all is changed. Webster, who would sooner see the British army batter down the Capitol, than vote a dollar for its defence; and Adams, who, (as Clay said,) wished to barter to the British the navigation of the Mississippi, are good Whigs. Yes, by your code, Webster and Adams are Whigs, and Gen. Jackson, Gen. Carroll and the Democrats are Tories. Walk in, and let me show you a few of the mischievous and dangerous effects of a National Bank. It is the testimony of these new-born Whig friends of yours. Come.

O. No, Sir, I haven't time now; and besides, a man who is blind and bigoted in his notions as you are, is beyond recovery. I shall leave you to grope in darkness and be ruined.

Mr. A. Ruined, indeed! Ha! ha! Well, you're a precious patriot. I have more faith in the labor of my hands, and the blessings of Providence on those labors, to save me from ruin, than I have in your quack paper remedies. Good day, my infatuated old friend. I am sorry for you. If you keep a journal of your peregrinations, have a title-page ready for it by next November, viz: "Live's Labor Lost."

O. (Aside.) I'm making nothing here. I will go to town and see if No. 6 has arrived. Hall promised to work this new militia system into a standing army.—We must make mountains out of mole hills. I'll go and see B., and frighten him with the standing army. I'll catch C. with the other trap about the wages of labor. I'll give 'em all pepper. We have but little chance of success: but it is the last; and we must make the most of it. [Exit.]

COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR THE CRISIS.

HANOVER, May 19, 1840.

My Dear Grandson:—I have now to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 6th ultimo, in which you mention your desire to obtain my views in relation to the character of the two great political parties which now divide this Union; but, before I proceed to this undertaking, permit me to express my heartfelt satisfaction at the prudent course which you have adopted in relation to that matter.—Most young men of your age, with youthful precipitancy, rush heedlessly into politics, take a firm and decisive stand, without acquainting themselves with one single principle of either party, and frequently to their great detriment in after life; but you, my son, I am rejoiced to see, have thought fit to consult the observation and experience of your decrepit old Grandfather, before launching into this tumultuous ocean.

During the administration of Washington, those two great parties of which you speak, took their stand in battle array. Our own Jefferson, who was then Secretary of State, contending for the rights of the people, and declaring it as his opinion, that they were capable of self-government, was the leader of the one now known as the Democratic Republican or Van Buren party:—John Adams, who was the V. President of the U. S., and Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, both of whom favored a Monarchy—a Senate for life, &c., had a very contemptible opinion of the farming and mechanical portion of the people; considered them incapable of self-government, and were desirous of establishing in our institutions different orders of society.—They were the leaders of the Federal, now also known by the name of the Whig, party. The principles of the two parties were not fairly understood by the people, until they felt the galling yoke of the Federal reign of John Adams, and at the next Presidential election, they came in mass to the rescue of their bleeding country—and exalted the patriot Jefferson to the Chair, whose feelings and sentiments were in community with their own.—The Monarchists received a stab from which they never recovered, until by intrigue, management and the lapse of time, they succeeded in gulling the freemen of the U. S. into the belief, that they themselves were the Democrats—and that the defenders of the pure and spotless principles of Jefferson, were the Federalists. The consequence was the election of J. Q. Adams to the Presidency. He, however, like his Federal father, was destined to enjoy the honors and emoluments of that office but one term. The people discovered the fraud which had been practised upon them; and, at the next election, spoke in language not to be misunderstood. The Democrats have had the sway ever since that time, notwithstanding the unparalleled efforts of the Federal party to impose upon the people by the same deceptions and expedients.

You cannot suppose, my son, that a party entertain-

ing principles so obnoxious to the people, could have existed since the administration of Washington to the present day, without becoming much enfeebled, though I must confess that they have conducted their affairs with an adroitness highly commendable, and a degree of cunning almost inimitable; notwithstanding which, they have yearly decreased, excepting only occasions of panics, which is their favorite weapon, and which sometimes enables them, with the assistance of the ignorant and the apprehensive, to flutter awhile above their wonted levels; but, while all other victories, obtained by such means, and supported by such a cause—it is merely of ephemeral existence; for, it dies with the bubble through which it sprang into being.—But for this favorite instrument of warfare to which I have alluded, the Whig party would long since have dwindled into utter insignificance, and only remembered as a faction once formidable, on account of the diabolical principles which they inculcated, and as a means of bringing into action and public view, the gigantic mind and firm stand of Jefferson for the people.

My son, this battle will be fought again in November next; and it is one in which you are now old enough to take a part. (Heaven grant it may be the part of Jefferson, of Jackson, of the people!) The enemy have received a fresh recruit and new supplies. They have entered into a coalition with our peace-disturbers at the North, and other rebellious factions. They have raised the yell of all would-be usurpers—of all power-seekers. They pretend great affection for the people—the very victims whom they seek to crush—the very army which has always combated them. They have accused the People's Candidate of extravagance, in direct opposition to the Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, made by a call from the Senate, and which proves the falsity of their vile harangue. They accuse the President of approving the details of Mr. Poinsett's bill, brought forward for the better organization of the militia, (and which they, without regard to truth or common honesty, call a standing army,) when he (the President) has never expressed an opinion on the subject. They themselves are guilty of the grossest inconsistencies. They resort to the most abject and servile means, for the accomplishment of the most nefarious schemes. In effect, they are waging war against the Constitution; that sacred instrument, which protects the poor and the oppressed. Ah, my son, arouse and march under the banner of your country! Did you—did all the freemen of this Union know what I do, and could see what I have seen, I would no longer tremble for the liberties of my country. I have fought by the side of Washington and Lafayette—I have grasped in affection, my eyes beaming with joy, and a heart overflowing with gratitude, the hand of Jefferson and of Madison. These men I supported. It is in defence of their principles, that I am now willing to offer up my life; and, though I am lame, palsied, and almost blind, if the Lord spare my life until November next, I shall give I expect my last vote to Mr. Van Buren, for President of the U. S.

My dear son, one request, and I have done for the present! I know, that you are a young man of education, and mind sufficient to understand plain English—I know that you are as yet free from party prejudice, as you have no political ambition to gratify; no vengeance to wreak upon those in power.—I therefore request, that you take the doctrines of the Democratic party, and examine them carefully, calmly, and honestly—compare them with the principles which the Opposition entertained last year, (as they have none now,) and let me hear the result of your deliberation. Doing this, I doubt not but you will be found maintaining with patriotic zeal the same principles which your grandfather ever loved and cherished, and which it would be his pride and gratification to see you support.

Your devoted grandpapa,
SIMEON BERTRAND.

FOR THE CRISIS.

My Reasons, why I shall vote for Martin Van Buren.

1. He has always acted with the Democratic party, and against the Aristocracy.
2. He has fought side by side with Andrew Jackson for the maintenance of our Constitutional rights.
3. When a Candidate for the Presidency, he did not suffer himself to be placed under the care of a Committee, to shun responsibility and evade the inquiries of an independent People.
4. He promptly gave us pledges upon the most important political questions, which he has so far faithfully complied with.
5. He has strictly adhered to the letter and spirit of that Constitution, which he has sworn to support—in all of his acts.
6. He would place the finances of our country upon a sound basis, so far as he is concerned, not destroying credit, but preserving sound credit.
7. He has, amidst the threats, menaces, artifices, and combinations of every discordant faction, fulfilled the engagements of the nation, preserved our character and credit, notwithstanding the combined efforts of the opposition, to destroy it—in all this the People have sustained him—(Witness the majority in both Houses of Congress)—hence I love him.

8. When, through the prodigality and corruption of the Banking community, the funds of the Government were rendered unavailable, he nobly resisted the combined efforts of this monied power (to render it bankrupt,) and recommended a system for the safe keeping and disbursement of the public money, subject to the control of the People through their Representatives—(the constitutionality of which has not been questioned)—For this, an untiring and ceaseless war has been waged against him since the summer of 1837 by the Bank and wild speculating party—yet the People have sustained him, and now say that such shall be the law of the land.

9. In all of the warlike attitudes in which we have been placed, whether caused by foreign invasion or internal dissensions, he has ever shown an anxious disposition for peace, upon fair and honorable terms, and war as a last resort.

10. And lastly, whereas his public acts have all been scrutinized by both friends and foes; and whereas, an intelligent and independent People, jealous of their rights, have been made fully acquainted therewith, and have sustained him—and whereas, the three years of his Administration has, under all the above unprecedented difficulties, added fresh laurels to the vigor and independence of our republican institutions—therefore, I am resolved, should he remain firm until November next, to vote for him as our President for the coming four years.

A Whig after the Old Fashion.

My Reasons why I shall not vote for W. H. Harrison.

1. He has upon all occasions been found acting with a party properly called the Federal Party, so called because of their support of the elder Adams, through his unconstitutional and aristocratic Administration—of Alien and Sedition Law memory.

2. As a proof of his Federal principles, he applauded Gen. Jackson's Proclamation and Force Bill, according to Daniel Webster's construction—which was thought by some of Gen. Jackson's friends to be the only Federal act of his Administration—I believe the only act approved by Harrison.

3. He has always been in favor of a high Tariff, and for Internal Improvements by the General Government—enriching one portion of our Union at the expense of the other. These are the fundamental doctrines of the Federal Party.

4. He has voted for selling white men, to the highest bidder, for a stated period, because they were too poor to pay to the Commonwealth of Ohio certain fines and costs. And in full keeping with this, he ratified a law while Governor of Indiana Territory to sell or hire out such poor white persons for similar offences—and in the event of their absconding, that they should be whipped with thirty-nine stripes. These are matters of record.

5. He has shown that he is at heart an Abolitionist, for the following reasons: At 18 years of age, he says he belonged to an Abolition Society, and up to 1833 lived in the faithful performance of its obligations. He has more recently declared in favor of applying our surplus revenue to the purchase of the slaves of the South and West; and further, he never could have been the candidate of the Federal Party, but for the influence of the Abolition party—The delegation of every Abolition State voting for him. (See Mr. Bloodgood's Circular, where he says the Abolitionists would not generally vote for Mr. Clay.)

6. He has shown by his acts since his nomination, that he is designed as the tool of this combination of parties to serve their purpose in breaking down our Republican Administration, that they may establish a great National Bank—revive the Tariff System—enact their dear Alien and Sedition Laws—abridge the freedom of speech and of the press, which is the palladium of our liberties—deprive an office holder of his political rights—give us a shinplaster currency—pay off the laborer in small promises instead of small change—create every substitute for specie or a sound Constitutional Currency—in short, that would establish or revive a monied aristocracy to run over and dictate to the Democracy of Numbers. As a proof that he is an instrument to do their bidding, he has been put under the care of a Committee, and held subject to their dictates—refuses through them to give his views on any question.—This is without a parallel in the history of our country—and had every principle which may have characterized his whole life been purely Democratic, (which has been entirely the reverse,) this act of his skulking behind a Committee to evade responsibility—his refusing prompt replies to the inquiries of the People upon political subjects, &c. would be ample grounds for every true and independent American to treat his pretensions with indignant contempt.—And surely, People of America, you will not bow to such an arrangement as this. For one, I say, no, never.

I am no lawyer, but speak the plain language of a farmer. I am no aspirant to office, but have the good of my country alone at heart; therefore am

A Whig after the Old Fashion.

PATRIOTIC. "Mother," said an urchin one day in May, "how long is it before the 4th of July?" "Six weeks from to-morrow," was the reply.—"I'll be darn'd if I'll wait," says Bob, "give me my crackers and I'll fire 'em now."—*N. Y. Chronicle.*

Bob must be a Harrisonite—they have first off all their crackers in advance, and have nothing for the day of action but burnt paper and lots of smoke.—*Pennsylvania.*

RICHMOND, Va., SATURDAY, JUNE 6.

"A wise and frugal Government which shall restrain men from injuring one another; shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement; and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government."—MR. JEFFERSON'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Views of the Presidential Election.

Address to the People of Virginia.—[No. 3.]

We have shown in our last No. that Wm. H. Harrison was a Federalist in the Olden Time—a Federalist, according to the testimony of John Adams—a Federalist, according to his own confession, with the exception of the Alien and Sedition acts—an avowed friend of John Adams—a protégé of John Adams; and indebted to him for the two first civic offices he ever enjoyed, when the test of appointment was devotion to his administration—and an open supporter of his standing army, when it was a strong party measure. We have shown, upon the cotemporary authority of the Aurora, that he was considered as a decided Federalist, along with Sitgreaves and Harper. We have shown, that he voted as an Elector for John Quincy Adams, supported his high-toned Federal Administration, and was indebted to his patronage for his Embassy to Colombia. If all these circumstances do not demonstrate him to be the friend of the two Adamses, and the supporter of the two strongest Federal Administrations, that have cursed our country, of what value is human testimony in defining the position of public men. But why go back even to the days of '99? We shall proceed to analyse the opinions he has more recently delivered, the measures he has supported, the votes he has given upon all the great questions, which have formed the lines of demarcation between the two political parties.—Why cant to the People about the electioneering Letter, which he addressed to his constituents in Ohio, in 1822; and which W. C. Rives and his Federal allies are attempting to turn into political capital? Why talk to us of the only document, in which he has thought proper to express any respect to the principles of the old Jeffersonian School? "Every other political creed which has been published, almost every great measure which he has supported, is in direct collision with these barren declarations. They but show how imperfectly the principles of that school were understood, and how readily they were abandoned." General Harrison is a Federalist both in theory and in practice. A Federalist is a politician, who adopts the broad theory of Alexander Hamilton on the construction of the Constitution. He is a Latitudinous Constructionist, who discards the touchstone of the two rigorous tests, which are laid down by Mr. Madison's Report: "The first question is, whether the power be expressed in the Constitution? If it be, the question is decided. If it be not expressed, the next inquiry must be, whether it is properly an incident to an express power, and necessary to its execution. If it be, it may be exercised by Congress. If it be not, Congress cannot exercise it." And Mr. M.'s Report moreover holds, that as "the powers of the Federal Government" result "from the compact to which the States are parties," so "in case of a deliberate, palpable and dangerous exercise of other powers, not granted by the said compact, the States have the right, and are in duty bound, to arrest the progress of the evil." These principles constitute the great Virginia State Rights Republican School—and on the other hand, a deviation from them forms the character of the original Federal School. Apply these tests to the general stream of William H. Harrison's votes, measures and opinions; and no impartial man can hesitate to pronounce him a Federalist, even of the Webster School. On every occasion, the friends of the rights of the States have regarded with the most vigilant jealousy the encroachments of the Federal Government—the National Tariff—the National Bank—a National system of Internal Improvements—a National interference with the rights of the slaveholding States, by the appropriation of money, or by any other means—and also those former opinions of the Supreme Court of the U. S., which have sanctioned the most alarming extensions of the Federal authority. But upon these points, what is Gen. Harrison's latest theory of the Federal power? and what are the measures, by which he would seem uniformly to have carried it into execution? We submit the following extracts from the General's Address of the 4th July, 1833, delivered at Cheviot, Ohio, only seven years ago, and eighteen years since the publication of that electioneering Address to which Mr. Rives and his echoes have professed to attach so much importance. Compare these latter expositions with all the doctrines which are maintained in Madison's Report, and by the soundest Jurists of the Virginia School—and see in how remarkable a manner they clash with each other:

"This division of power between the Government of the Union and of the States, has created a belief that they must, of necessity, become antagonist principles. Not that they are equally dangerous; for, whilst the General Government is considered the very Perseus which is eventually to destroy the whole system, the State Right interest is represented in the amiable light of exerting

himself only to preserve the balance of power intended by the Constitution. That some of the ablest and best men in the country are of this opinion, I most sincerely believe. But I as firmly believe that this dreadful spectre of consolidation has been sometimes raised, and exposed to the indignation of the people, as a means of effecting purposes which are not always promotive of the public good. If the evidences of encroachment and usurpation, on the part of the General Government, are asked for, all, or, at least, those which are most relied upon, will be found to have been sanctioned by the first Congress held after the adoption of the Constitution, in which were many men of the first rank in talents and patriotism who had served in the Convention. Did these men really mistake the meaning of an instrument, in the construction of which they had largely contributed when they sustained the power of the General Government, to protect our manufactures by duties on foreign goods," (the Tariff Law,) "and passed laws containing the same provisions with the much abused law of the last session for enforcing the collection of the revenue," (the Force Bill,) "But if they were unfaithful, by what means was the patriotic vigilance of the father of his country lulled into security? If the fact that the General Government has ultimately prevailed in the few collisions which have taken place between it and the Government of the States, is adduced as evidence of the dangerous accumulation of power in the former, it must be remembered that in all these cases public opinion has uniformly determined in favor of the pretensions set up by the General Government, and that even the States who were parties in the contests, have, in every instance, acquiesced in this decision. Considered as is the Government of the Union, it appears to me that there is not the least danger of its encroaching upon the rights of the States. Even in cases when the injurious operations of a measure of the General Government is confined to a few, and are beneficial to a large majority of the States, it would be evidence of as little foresight as of moral rectitude in the latter, to countenance the injury. A change of circumstances might reverse the situation of some of the parties, and they would all in their turns become the instruments and victims of oppression. Such a state of things cannot take place, until the people of this country shall have retrograded in knowledge and morals for a century. The feelings of the people, and indeed of a majority of the National Legislature, bear strongly in favor of the States. Can there be a better evidence of this, than the passage of the law for the gradual abandonment of the Tariff system, at the last session of Congress?—Can it be doubted, that that measure was any thing but a concession to the complaints of oppression and injustice which had been so strongly and repeatedly urged by our Southern brethren? Can any one look at the prosperity which the Tariff has produced to the grain-growing, the grazing and manufacturing States, and say that the people whom it enriches could be tired of its operation? But there are those who have dared to impute the concession to our fears. Fears! of what? of the physical force of two-thirds of South Carolina? If any thing like a feeling of that kind existed, it was the fear of seeing a prominent and highly prized member of our political family tarnish her great name by an act of folly and madness."

Now, citizens of Virginia, read these passages for yourselves, and say, whether there be any man of the old '98 school, who will sanction the heresies which they contain? General Harrison passes over the Bank of the United States, though it presents one of the very strongest evidences of encroachment, and the "most relied upon." He claims the power to establish the protecting American System. He denies that "there is the least danger of (THE GENERAL GOVERNMENT) encroaching upon the rights of the States," when so many encroachments of the Federal Government stare us in the face. Where, we ask you, have been all the contests and struggles of Virginia, to bring back the Government "to the Republican track," and to its first principles? Where were the fears and efforts of Thomas Jefferson? Where have been the struggles of the friends of State Rights, for thirty years? Where the triumphs which Virginia obtained in the civil revolution of 1800? Where our successful contests with J. Q. Adams's heresies of the general welfare, and where the benefits we have reaped from the Administration of Andrew Jackson, in bringing us back to many of the first principles of the Constitution—the Maysville veto, and the veto and dissolution of the national charter of a tremendous Bank? To go back to a more distant day—where were the Alien and Sedition laws—and the celebrated Report of Madison? Can any one read the history of these days, the days of terror in John Adams's administration, and yet declare that "there is not the least danger of its encroaching upon the rights of the States"? We deemed it impossible for any man, acquainted with the history of the Government, to hazard so rash an assertion. But Gen. H. goes further. Hear him again!

"Under the influence of that opinion, the framers of our Constitution have inserted in it all the guards to the rights of the minority, and those of individuals, which were suggested by their own experience, and the lights which history affords. A mere paper declaration of those rights would have been of little consequence. But their preservation has been effectually secured, even against the powerful influence of public opinion. This security given to minorities and individuals, is the most beautiful and interesting feature in our system. And it is not more beautiful in theory, than it has been found effectual in practice. By a course as quiet, as peaceable as the operation of those laws which the Creator has assigned for the government of the material world, the judiciary department restrains the other branches of the General Government from the exercise of unconstitutional powers, and the States from those aberrations to which a tendency has been so often manifested. Almost at the commencement of our Government, one of our principal cities witnessed the sublime spectacle of the officers of the Supreme Court, covered by no shield but a commission under their authority, penetrating through armed battalions acting under the special authority of the then most powerful member of the Confederacy, and serving a

process to restore to an obscure individual the property of which he had unjustly been deprived. We have also seen, upon a more recent occasion, another State, by no means the least powerful of the Union, cheerfully yielding her own deliberate opinion of her rights, to the award of that Court in favor of an unpopular institution." (And what says the General to their decision in the case of the Cohens, and to the indignation with which it was received, and is still remembered in Virginia?) "Thus protecting (says he) the weak against the strong, the humble and persecuted against the high and exalted; can there be any danger that this august tribunal will tarnish the lustre of its exalted character, and become the humble instrument of its co-departments in the exercise of unjust and unconstitutional powers?"

He relies upon the Federal Judiciary, as the great and only expositor of the Constitution, when the Virginia Report of '99, expressly disclaims the doctrine. It denies the ultimate power of the Judiciary as the sole expositor of the Constitution. It states expressly, that there are cases of paramount importance, which cannot come within the cognizance of the Judiciary—And it also maintains, that the parties to the compact, (the sovereign States,) have a right to judge of great infractions, and are bound to interpose to arrest the progress of the evil—not by Nullification, for *there* Harrison and Webster are right—but in the numerous modes which are specified in the Report. In a word, Gen. Harrison takes the very ground which was taken in '99 by the then Federal States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Delaware, &c., while Virginia maintains the true theory of the Constitution, as it is promulgated in her celebrated Report of '99.

Not one word of censure or complaint does he breathe against the former sweeping decisions of the Supreme Court—which have changed even the terms of the Constitution—converting *necessary* into *convenient*, and they might as well have said *expedient*. Their decision in the case of the Cohens, of the Bank, &c., &c., seems to pass for so much gospel with General Harrison. In vain has Jefferson struggled! In vain has Roane written—in vain has Philip P. Barbour spoken, in opposition to these monstrous doctrines. There is not (according to the Federal candidate) the least danger of its encroaching upon the rights of the States—and if the Supreme Court had sanctioned the Alien and Sedition laws, just as the Sedition law was carried into effect in this very town, in the case of Callender, by Judge Chase, we presume the General would still have considered the Supreme Court as the only oracle of the Constitution. Very different indeed was the opinion entertained by Thomas Jefferson concerning Harrison's infallible oracle and his supreme arbiter of the Constitution—"The Judiciary Department (says that really great man and staunch Republican) has continued the reprobated system; and although new matter has been occasionally incorporated into the old, yet the leaven of the old mass seems to assimilate itself to the new, and after twenty years' confirmation of the federated system by the voice of the nation, declared through the medium of elections, we find the Judiciary on every occasion, still driving us into consolidation."—*Jefferson's Correspondence*, vol. 4, p. 316.—Again—"The Judiciary of the United States is the subtle corps of sappers and miners, constantly working under ground to undermine the foundations of our confederated fabric. They are construing our Constitution from a co-ordination of a general and special government to a general and supreme one alone. They will lay all things at their feet," &c., Vol. 4 p. 337. And in defiance of Jefferson's opinions and of the records of the Court itself, will General H. still ridicule the idea of "any danger" from "this august tribunal?"

The speech from which we have made these fearful extracts, abounds with others perhaps still more startling. It is in this speech, that he recommends the appropriation of the *whole surplus* revenue, with the sanction of the slaveholding States, to the purposes of emancipation, and pronounces that *such* a consent can make the appropriation *constitutional*! But one of the most objectionable parts of the speech is the last remarkable stroke, as follows:

"I have thus, fellow citizens, endeavored to explain to you the principles upon which the Government of our Union is formed. I recommend to you, however, the Proclamation of the President of the U. States, issued on the 10th of December, and the speeches of Mr. Webster, delivered in the Senate of the United States, at their last session of Congress, in answer to the arguments of Mr. Calhoun, as containing the most eloquent and satisfactory expositions of those principles that have recently been published. By issuing that Proclamation, I think General Jackson has rendered a service to his country of greater magnitude than his splendid victory at New Orleans."

The Proclamation contains the most satisfactory exposition of the principles of our Government! Why, this is the very paper, which has given so much alarm to the orthodox friends of the President, and to the friends of the Constitution. So sensible was the President himself of the constructions of which it was susceptible, that he had the candor and magnanimity to come out, through an authoritative article in the *Globe*, and deny the constructions which had been given to it—and that exposition he authorized us in March, 1837, to hold as binding upon him, as if it had been

signed "Andrew Jackson." May we not even hope, that the time is not far distant, when we shall have a full and satisfactory revelation of the whole subject from that illustrious man? But Gen. Harrison does not stop here. He virtually declares himself a Federalist of the Webster School. He adopts Mr. Webster's Speech of 1833 as his text-book—one of the "abominable errors" of which is the following: "I maintain, (says Mr. W.,) that the Constitution of the U. States is not a league, confederacy, or compact, between the People of the several States in their sovereign capacities; but a Government proper, founded on the adoption of the people, and creating direct relation between itself and individuals." We make no labored comment on this doctrine. It is at war with all the received sentiments of our State Rights School—of Jefferson, Madison, Roane, and Van Buren.

Again: In this speech he declares in general terms, without limiting his proposition to Nullification, that "the right of State interposition strikes at the very foundation of the legislative power of Congress." That "it is undeniably true, that the framers of the Constitution intended to create a national judicial power which should be paramount on national subjects." And that the Supreme Court is constituted "the appellate tribunal in all cases of a constitutional nature, which assume the shape of a suit, in law or equity." (Of course the Alien and Sedition acts!) Madison's Resolutions and Report hold a different doctrine. *Hear them!*

"Resolved, That this Assembly doth explicitly and pre-emptorily declare, that it views the powers of the Federal Government, as resulting from the compact to which the States are parties, as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument constituting that compact, as no farther valid than they are authorized by the grants enumerated in that compact; and that, in case of a deliberate, palpable and dangerous exercise of other powers, not granted by the said compact, the States who are parties thereto, have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose, for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits, the authorities, rights and liberties appertaining to them."—(3d Resolution.) Mr. Madison's Report of '99-1800, in commenting upon this resolution, declares that it "relates to those great and extraordinary cases in which all the forms of the Constitution may prove ineffectual against infractions dangerous to the essential rights of the parties to it. The resolution supposes that dangerous powers, not delegated, may not only be usurped and executed by the other departments, but that the judicial department also, may exercise or sanction dangerous powers beyond the grant of the Constitution, and consequently that the ultimate right of the parties to the Constitution, to judge whether the compact has been dangerously violated, must extend to violations by one delegated authority, as well as by another; by the Judiciary, as well as by the Executive, or the Legislature."

We address ourselves to every Democrat of Virginia—But we particularly address ourselves to every State Rights Whig—to every Nullifier even of the entire South. We address ourselves to such men as Judge Uphur, and to Robert M. T. Hunter. Can they take this Politician to their bosom, without violating every great State Rights Principle which they have ever professed? Do not these opinions constitute him, to all intents and purposes, a Federalist?

Let us, however, Citizens of Virginia, descend to particulars—Let us see what were General Harrison's votes, when he was in Congress, upon the doctrines of the Old School. Let us see how bravely he carries out his Webster theory of the Constitution by his acts and measures!—This brings us at once to the various measures he has supported on Internal Improvement, on the Tariff, and on the other specifications which are opening before us.

INSOLENT CONTEMPT OF THE PEOPLE, By the Whig Press.

The prostituted Richmond Whig, in affecting to give an account of a Democratic meeting lately held in the Metropolis, seems to exult in the circumstances, that neither of the Judges, nor the President of a Bank named by it, was present in the meeting; but that it was chiefly made up of shopkeepers, mechanics, &c. Now, if the officers alluded to by the Whig were in truth absent, and absent, too, from a reluctance to bear their part in the great contest now going on between the People and the Whig conspirators against their liberties, then surely were these officers exceedingly to blame; equally deficient in duty, perhaps, and equally deserving of censure, as they would be, should they flee away from a foreign hostile army, if one were to be landed upon our shores. Foreign armies could neither subdue the patriotic spirit of our people, nor lessen their devotion to our free Institutions; traitors at home, protected with the privileges of citizens, are more dangerous, because of their opportunities by falsehood and deception of embittering the feelings of our People; of arraying them against each other, and of seducing their affections from their faithful friends, and from principles and measures indispensable to their freedom and happiness.—It is difficult to imagine how the solemn and primary obligations which every man bears to society; obligations, binding him to protect that society, (and himself as a part of it,) can possibly be lost or discharged by the circumstance, that an individual has, in a peculiar degree, been distinguished as an object of confidence or kindness. It would rather seem, on the contrary, that the duties of vigilance, activity and fidelity, were, as to such an individual, augmented in proportion to the kindness and confidence bestowed upon him. And it would therefore follow, that a public officer, who should forbear his honest exertions to defeat and expose

the plots of conspirators against the liberties of his country, would be justly obnoxious to severer censure than any person could be, who, from position or from any other cause, may not have the power of being equally useful. The ridicule attempted against the Democratic meeting in Richmond, and the foundation for that poor attempt, are well worthy of the scandalous Whig, and of the no-principle party, of which it is called the mouth-piece in Virginia. This party has often been held forth as comprising the wise, the learned, the wealthy, the genteel, the elite of the land, whilst its opponents have been as often stigmatized as the ignorant, the vulgar, "the associated poverty," the agrarians, the destructives, the Loco Focos, the "huge-pawed," "the odoriferous" or strong-smelling Democracy, who, some of their upstart leaders have said, never ought to busy themselves with matters of government, and never can be fitted to do so—though, upon a close examination, the arrogant pretensions of these Whigs will be found to rest entirely upon the parade and appearance of superior wealth, and upon the control of credit, obtained by having the command of the banking corporations, and the command, through the means of their *rag money*, of numerous frothy attorneys, who clamor, and brag, and bully, and slander for them, at every cross road and court-house in the country.—To such a party, it must indeed appear a great stretch both of the presumptuous and ridiculous, for a portion of the REAL PEOPLE, without leave, the presence or the assistance of either a bank officer or any other officer, or of any noisy vaporing attorney, to assemble, of their own accord, and undertake to discuss questions of public policy, or the qualifications of candidates for high political trusts.—In the view of such a party, whose present leader and idol is recommended to them by more than one endeavor to sell into slavery the free white men and women of this country, who happened not to be blessed with wealth; and to place them in the degraded situations of being ADVERTISED AS RUNAWAYS, and subjected to the LASH at the hands of NEGROES; it seems doubtless a more appropriate occupation for vulgar, dirty shopkeepers and mechanics, to follow through their kindred dirt, after mock log cabins, and cider barrels with gourds swinging to them, uttering senseless shouts of HURRAH for old Tip!—HURRAH for old Tip!—These are occupations considered by Whigs as being levelled to the minds of the ignorant, vulgar, dirty, "strong-smelling" Democracy, who, they have said, must always be incapable of intelligent or useful interference with matters of government. Employments so appropriate in the estimation of those who propose them, will serve to prevent on the part of the same vulgar Democracy, such troublesome, impertinent enquiries as the following, viz: 1st. Whether Gen. Harrison was not a black cockade Federalist, under old John Adams, and did not, to the last moment, support that man, who dared to impose a gag law on the People, and to raise a Standing Army in order to enforce that and other flagrant abuses? 2d. Whether Gen. Harrison has not supported every Federal measure proposed under every administration, from the time of old John Adams down to the present day; as, for instance, a High Tariff, for the benefit of manufactures, to the injury of agriculture and commerce; a power, on the part of the Federal Government, to make roads and cut canals through the States, without the consent of the latter, and to levy and appropriate money for those purposes; to incorporate an enormous Federal Bank, and establish its branches in all the States, even in opposition to their wishes and to the prejudice of their own domestic institutions? 3d. Whether Gen. Harrison did not himself propose and report to Congress a most oppressive and preposterous militia system, by which the private soldiers were to be compelled, not only to furnish their own arms and equipments, and to attend musters and trainings without pay or rations, whilst the officers were to receive pay and support, and by which system, also, the Federal Government were to have control of the youth of our country, by establishing military teachers over them in all the schools in the U. States? 4th. Whether he has not recommended the collection and appropriation of money by the Federal Government to purchase and emancipate our slaves; making us, in effect, buy our own slaves with our own money? 5th. Whether he is not now the favorite and special nominee of the Abolitionists, a band of hellish incendiaries, who long have been, and who still are fanning the fires and whetting the instruments of insurrection in all the Southern States; and does not at this moment favor the schemes of these same incendiaries, for interference by the Federal Government with the tenure of property in slaves in the States and in the District of Columbia? And lastly—Whether it be not wholly subversive of Representative Government, and arrogant in the last degree, for a candidate to conceal his principles and designs from the people, whilst he asks the power to rule them, according to his secret purposes, and the purposes of his secret confederates? Yes—Hurra for Old Tip!—Hurra for Log Cabins!—Hurra for Cider Barrels and Cider Gourds—and away with all troublesome questions about principles or measures!—Such are the powerful Whig arguments addressed to a rational, in-

dependent People—jealous of their liberties, and capable of self-government; and by which, it is insultingly supposed, that such a People are to be carried captive to a weak old man, or rather to the schemes of his selfish Federal employers!

New Development.—We have before us the "Philanthropist," the Abolition paper of Cincinnati, of the 25th May. The first article is a letter from Washington City, of the 1st May. The Editor says it is from "a Whig Abolitionist." We go further, and ask at once, whether it be not from the pen of a Whig member of Congress—*alias*, Joshua Giddings of Ohio. The writer's object is to unite the Abolitionists upon Gen. Harrison. He shows, that there is an actual affinity between Abolitionism and Harrisonism—that "the minds of the Northern Whigs are preparing to act with Abolitionists," &c., &c. He relies upon two facts, for proofs of his propositions: 1st. That "but little attention is to be paid to what Mr. Van Buren or Gen. Harrison said against Abolition in years that are past; but (says he) I judge them both by their acts and the acts of their friends of late, and at the present time." And 2dly. "I take it for granted, that Gen. H. was preferred to Mr. Clay, in order to unite the Abolitionists with the Whig party; that this is regarded by the whole country, both by Whigs and Democrats." The writer (alias Mr. G.) goes on to say, that in consequence of this understanding, the friends of Mr. Van Buren denounce the Abolitionists, and General Harrison as the Abolition candidate—whereas, a very different feeling prevails among his (H.) friends;—that at the Harrisburg Convention, Abolitionists were present, and had their portion of influence and more too, in proportion to numbers; that it is well understood throughout all the Northern States, that Abolitionists are not to be proscribed or denounced, but to be treated courteously and respectfully. Thus all may see that the Whig papers which have heretofore been bitter against Abolition, either say nothing on the subject now, or speak respectfully in regard to it. Men who, six months since, were unreluctant in their opposition to Abolitionists, are now trying to reconcile the friends to associate with, and respect those who are engaged in the cause of humanity. I know some elevated examples of this description. The writer concludes, that "the Northern Whigs are preparing to act with the Abolitionists; while at present there is no hope of bringing any portion of the Van Buren party to favor Abolition, while the President and his party, and all his leading friends persecute and revile all who appreciate the value of our national rights; and secondly, I conclude that the Whig party generally will be willing, without making it a public and distinct point, to take for public office those who favor the cause of Abolition." He earnestly dissuades the Abolitionists, therefore, from the "organization of a third party," but urges them to unite upon Harrison, and affiliate with his friends. What say you to this, Citizens of the South? Will you affiliate with such a band as this? Will you unite with the Northern Whigs and the fanatic Abolitionists, in order to put up a man, who is their candidate, and whose friends in Ohio and New York are willing to avail themselves of the assistance of your enemies? But do you not see from this letter of Joshua Giddings, who says he has "the whole field of battle before him," why it is that Gen. Harrison will not speak boldly out against the Abolitionists, and why it is that he has put himself into the hands of a "confidential committee," in order that he might not speak out? Do you not see, that he is afraid to offend the Abolitionists, lest he should lose their votes? And are you prepared to join in so unbecoming a combination against your own rights, in favor of a candidate who has not the moral courage to declare that he is with you, and that he will veto any bill, lest he offend the money interests of Southern Rights? Is this the candidate who is worthy of your support? Must the earth quake before you rouse, and recognize your friends from your enemies? At this vital point, those who are not for you, are against you.

Low Prices.—The Feds. are striving to profit by the "hard times." They are clamoring against the low prices, and lay the whole pressure at the door of Mr. V. Buren. But if flour, tobacco, and cotton be low abroad, how can they be high here? Are they not controlled by the law of supply and demand? And if we have a large supply at home, and a reduced demand in the foreign market, how can they be high here? The demand is not alone affected by the state of our money market, but more so, by the money market in England, where there has been the same overbanking which has embarrassed us.—Besides, is this the first time, that we have had low prices in the U. States? Let us cast our eyes back, and see whether prices have not been still lower, even during the days of a National Bank.—In Niles's Register of November 6th, 1819, we have the course of Exchange in two of the Southern States, as follows:

"Virginia.—The old banks, 1 1/2 dis.; Bank of the Valley, from 1 1/2 to 2 dis.—no other notes in the market. North Carolina, 6 1/2 to 7 dis.; South Carolina, 3; Georgia, 3; Louisiana, no demand, but 1 1/2, if sold." And the same Register of Nov. 30, 1819, says: "A writer in the Richmond Enquirer, thus describes the state of the times.—I confine my views to a single county, in order that they may be more striking, though I know full well, that the same distress exists everywhere. Of gold and silver we have next to none; of Virginia and U. S. Bank paper but little—of North Carolina money, if it had credit enough to pay taxes, buy necessities, and discharge debts; but it has lost its credit—the merchant will not take it; the sheriff demands a discount when he takes it for taxes," &c., &c. "The iron business languishes; the wagon shops are shut up; taxes cannot be paid in the required money; the flinty creditor asks Virginia paper or gold or silver, for his debt; the debtor, unable to raise either, gives up his land, and, ruined and undone, seeks a home for himself and family in the western wilderness. This picture is sometimes realized. A tract of land, of 300 acres, sold a few days ago, about 25 miles from my house, for \$300 only. The improvements on this land I have heard variously represented; some say they were worth \$1,500, some much more. A horse valued at \$50, was sold the other day near my house for \$10; and two wagon horses were sold about the same time for \$40, which I well know cost nearly \$200." Niles's Register of Oct. 9, 1819, quotes as follows:—"Wheat.—The Buffalo Journal of the 14th ultimo says, considerable quantities of wheat of the first quality were sold during the past week at thirty-seven and a half cents the bushel; and the Gazette says, it did not meet a ready sale even at that price." Again, in another year, "There was a considerable sale of good and wholesome flour in Baltimore a few days since, which after the cost of transportation and other incidental expenses were paid, yielded the owner only \$1.25 cents the barrel."

[Niles's Register, March 17, 1821.] This was under the reign of the National Bank and during the era of 'good feeling,' in Mr. Monroe's administration. But no one then had the folly to tell the farmers that these low prices were owing to the Administration, nor could they be charged to the want of a National Bank. But let us come ten years later—take the year 1830, with a National Bank, and 1840 without a National Bank. The prices in those years in the great Western market for breadstuffs and provisions, in Rochester, were as follows:

In April, 1830, with a National Bank.	In February, 1840, without a National Bank.
Wheat, 75 cents a bushel.	Wheat, 88 cents a bushel.
Flour, \$2.25 the barrel.	Flour, \$4.25 the barrel.

Again, a merchant of Fayetteville quotes from his books a tabular list of prices for several years, from 1813 to 1840, for the "N.

Carolinian." Thus, in '31, cotton sold for 5 to 7 1/2 cents, tobacco from \$1 to 3, flour from 3 1/2 to 4 1/2, wheat from 75 to 8 cents, and so on.—The Charleston (S. C.) Advertiser furnishes a statement from one of the principal pork merchants of that city, of the prices which they have paid for pork from 1825 to 1839—and the following are the prices paid during J. Q. Adams's Administration, Jackson's 1st and 2d terms, and for 3 years of Mr. Van Buren's:

	The average price paid for pork in Charleston from 1825 to 1838, including Adams' term, was	21 8 1/2
"From 1829 to 1832, Jackson's 1st term, was	24 48 1/2	
"From 1833 to 1836, Jackson's 2d term, was	3 69	
"From 1837 to 1839, Van Buren's 1st term was	4 8 1/2	

In March, 1824, Mr. Clay made a Speech in Congress, in which he describes the general distress, which pervaded the country, and says, "It is indicated by the diminished exports of native produce; by the depressed and reduced state of our foreign navigation; by our declining commerce; by successive untimely crops of grain, perishing in our barnyards for the want of a market; by the remarkable diminution of the circulating medium, by the numerous bankruptcies, not limited to the trading class, but extending to all orders of society; by an universal complaint of the want of employment, and a consequent reduction of the price of labor," &c., &c.—But the present distress is not universal. The Patriot, published at Waldoborough, in Maine, gives the following account of the vessels built in that town in 1838, 9 and 40:

When Built.	No.	Aggregate Tonnage.
1838	11	14 979-95
1839	11	186 75-55
1840	11	estimated 2435
Total		511 9-95

"From the foregoing statements it will be seen, that the business of ship building has experienced a gradual increase for the last 3 years, and that the increase has been nearly threefold under the administration of Mr. Van Buren, compared with the Federal administration of J. Q. Adams."

But still the Whigs will attribute the present hard times to the Administration! Where are their proofs? Has not the Administration given time to the Banks to pay their debts to the Government, and has it not extended the credit upon the duty bonds of the merchants?—How is General Harrison's election to relieve us? Is the Hard Cider candidate going to pay my debt, or yours?—to pay what the debtors owe the Banks, or what the Banks owe the People, or the West owes to the East? Where is he to get the solid capital (the specie) for new Banks to be established on solid foundation? Has he the gift of Midas, the cap of Fortunatus, or the lamp of Aladdin? It is all a humbug.

A Capital Hit.—"The Hon." J. M. BOTT'S Executive Committee.—Mr. Parmenter, a Democratic member of the H. of Representatives from Massachusetts, in his admirable speech to the House, cites a Circular signed by the "Executive Committee" at Washington, among whom are Botts, Saltonstall, (of Hartford Convention memory), Clarke of N. Y., and Smith of Connecticut, (virtual Abolitionists), in which the Committee call upon the People of the country to restore the Government "to the days of our Patriot Presidents."—Mr. P. takes his colleague (Saltonstall) to task, and asks him whom he does consider "as Patriot Presidents"? Is it Jackson? No. Is it Monroe? No, for "so far as Mr. Monroe was opposed by party, I believe him (S.) to have been in opposition." Is it the virtuous Madison, then? Far from it.—Because Saltonstall was one of the celebrated Hartford Conventionists. Upon this branch of the subject, Mr. P. states this remarkable fact—that every member of the Hartford Convention "who is now alive, is of the Whig party, and every one who has deceased, died to that political party, and every one of its numerous names."—And yet this is the man, (a Hartford Conventionist, and besides, he is an Abolitionist, with whom the Representative of this District has united in an Executive Committee to change the President, and to control the vote of Virginia, on the eve of her election, by circulating thousands of a garbled and insidious handbill! This same Committee is now engaged in frisking and sending off a stream of publications, to operate upon the South, in favor of the candidate of the Abolitionists!

The Contrast.—How different are the candidates! Mr. Van Buren is for explaining his opinions—Gen. Harrison puts him off into the hands of a Confidential Committee, that he may not answer.—Mr. Van Buren, on the subject of Abolition, says: "I am not only willing, but desirous, gentlemen, that you should have the most thorough knowledge of my views and feelings upon the delicate and interesting subject [Abolition] with which your question is connected; and I shall endeavor to acquaint you with them in the fullest manner in my power."—G. N. H. on the same subject says, he will answer no interrogatories from friend or foe—and he says, through his Committee, "his policy is, that the General make some further declarations of his opinions to meet the public eye, while occupying his present position"—[as a candidate for the Presidency]—the very time, when he is bound to speak the plainest. And then as to the arguments of their friends, Harrison's address themselves to the senses—Van Buren's, to the understanding. The one employs all sorts of humbugs. They resort to log cabins, hard cider, and such mummery. The others, explain their principles, in long and able addresses, to the people. If one calls a Convention at Baltimore, they are principally convened from the towns, bankers, manufacturing men, speculators, giddy youths of fashion, &c., &c., who do not understand, and cannot reflect the sentiments of the people.—The other, principally from the country, who need to explain their views, and to reach the voice of the People.—No wonder, therefore, the Whigs resort to humbugs, and are afraid to come out with their principles, lest they fall into divisions. The truth is, "contempt for the People lies at the bottom of their whole scheme of Electioneering."

Who are his friends?—Cast your eyes around, and see who are Harrison's friends. Is there an old Federalist that has stood to the rack, down to the administration of John Q. Adams? He is Harrison's friend. Who comes next? The friends of a National Bank. Who next? The friends of appropriating the National Revenue to Roads and Canals, to the emancipation of slaves—the Abolitionists of the North—These are the supporters of Wm. H. Harrison. Look around you, and see how few, if any, are exceptions to the rule. Will Virginia then co-operate with such a Band?

Organized Organized!—The Republican Committees are organizing in Frederick and Knapwicks, King William, Albemarle, 1, Charlottesville, &c., &c. King William recommends a Convention in the Electoral District. Good! The move ought to be followed up everywhere. A letter from Winchester, 1st June, in the Globe, says—"The Democracy of Old Frederick responded to the call of the Central Committee to day, by one of the largest gatherings, from various parts of the county, that have been witnessed for years—thereby evincing a feeling that is not to be misunderstood."—A fine spirit is getting up every where. A letter from Halifax promises 500 Democratic majority in November—one from Mecklenburg from 2 to 25—one from Hot Springs, "the humbug of the Standing Army is all blown to the wind," and those who tickled at that point have again determined to rally around Van Buren—and that Old Bacton will give him a large majority in the Fall. A letter received yesterday promises from 30 to 250 in Accomac, whilst the Fed. will not receive more than 50.—A letter from Jefferson assures us of a heavy vote for Van Buren, if not a positive majority in that county. The ball is rolling onwards, and all will be well.

A letter has appeared in the R. Whig, from Washington, giving the most extravagant estimates for the Presidential election.—The Andromeda says, it is Mr. Senator Tallmadge's. But the author ought to be a man of such an extravagant production. He is kind enough to allow Mr. Van Buren but 23 votes, viz: New Hampshire, South Carolina, and Arkansas—25 are doubtless, viz: Maine, Mississippi, Alabama, and Missouri—25—and all the rest, viz: 248, are assigned to Gen. Harrison! "The force of folly can not further go." We have never seen anything more preposterous, than his statistics. We will hazard an estimate of our own.—All the slaveholding States, except Kentucky, for Van Buren, viz: 8; New Hampshire 7, Maine 10, New York 42, New Jersey 8, Pennsylvania 30, Illinois 5.—We claim also Ohio 21, and Indiana 9—146 is necessary to a choice.—So that, allowing Van Buren the 109 votes first mentioned, New Hampshire, Maine, and Illinois, he will want only 17 to elect him.—So that if he gets either Pennsylvania, or New York, or Ohio, he will unquestionably carry the day. And, as we are at present advised from the best authorities, the chances are in favor of his getting all of them. We cannot entertain a doubt about Pennsylvania. On Monday week, "the largest county meeting ever assembled in Western Pennsylvania" took place in Washington county—from 3,500 to 4,500 present. No log cabins, no hard cider—but they had beautiful banners with striking inscriptions. On one flag, was a gallant ship (the ship of State) with the inscription, "Martin Van Buren, Pilot—without a thinking Committee!"—There was also a very large banner carried by three men, on one side of which was, "Democracy addresses herself to the understanding of the People"—her weapon is common sense, not the nonsense of hard cider and log cabins!—and on the other, "Federalism addresses herself to the passions and prejudices, and not to the intelligence of the People." In this spirit they must conquer. The time is coming, when men will turn with disgust and loathing from the hard cider mummery of the Harrisonians.

Our "old friend" Tallmadge, who consults his passions much more than any principles he ever possessed, thinks fit to chide his friends here for entertaining a doubt about New York.—But does he "remember to forget" the gain of the Republican Party in this Spring's township Election? Why does he now speak of all the "bright prospects" of the Whigs in N. Y.? Why, of all they have done in N. Y., under the most unfavorable auspices? Does he forget that the Whig majority in 1837 was near 20,000—in 1838, it was reduced to near 10,000—and last Fall, to about 4,000? Is this the brightening prospect of which he boasts? He will lose New York—and his candidate is just in as fair a way of having "scarcely a State he can call his own," as Mr. Van Buren is.

The Globe confirms the letter of Mr. Robert Nicholas, Senator of Louisiana, about the negro procession in Washington. The Globe shows, that it was got up by two Whigs.

Let the South Awake!—One of the most startling acts of these eventful times, is the act just passed by the Whig Legislature of New York, forbidding any runaway negro from being removed from the State, until the case has been passed upon by a jury, and the master giving heavy security.—This in fact places the negro on a footing with the whites—and cuts off almost every chance of recovering our fugitive property, in the very face of the guarantee of the Federal Constitution. And this boon is given to the Abolitionists, to propitiate their support. Will not the South rouse, till the earth quake!

The Three Degrees.—The hard cider, the drink of the Feds., has more "properties" than Falstaff's "good Sherries sack."—His sack had only "a twofold operation in it"—whereas, this boasted cider has three characters in it. 1st. It is sweet cider, which most people of good taste like.—2d. Hard cider, which few like at all. But that is the drink which the Federal Whigs are so foolishly taking for their favorite beverage.—And last of all, Vinegar, which this hard cider is rapidly becoming.—It will have that last "property" by November, and no man will take it and drink it.

Green's Case.—still under argument.

The Kentucky Address.—Read this able and eloquent paper. The Crisis cannot give more valuable materials for forming the popular sentiment.

Items of News.

Congress.—The Bankrupt Bill is still before the Senate. Messrs. Clay of Alabama and Calhoun spoke on Tuesday and Wednesday again embracing Banks in the operations of the Bill—and on Wednesday, the question for excluding them was carried, by a vote of 28 yeas, and 16 noes. Mr. Clay of Kentucky then moved to strike out all those parts of the bill which include provisions for compulsory bankruptcy, and upon this motion he was entitled to the floor when the bill came up on Thursday.—On Thursday, Mr. Clay addressed the Senate on his motion, and Mr. Wright against it; but no question was taken.—The Senate has been occupied in a warm, general, political debate, growing out of a memorial presented on Tuesday by Mr. C. of Ky., from the late Postmaster at Reynoldsburg, Ohio, who had been removed from office. Mr. C. seized the occasion to attack the past and present Administrations. Mr. Allen defended them, and carried the war into the enemy's country.—Mr. Crittenden replied; Allen rejoined—and the whole subject of privy committees, log cabins, hard cider, &c., &c., were brought on the tapis.—On Tuesday, the Debate was continued between Crittenden and Allen.—A correspondent says, that A. made a powerful speech—the issue was fully made, as to Harrison's secrecy, his standing mute, &c., &c.

H. of R.—The Independent Treasury Bill still under discussion.—Many speeches to the House, but no decision.—On Thursday, Messrs. Williams of Massachusetts, and Smith of Vermont, addressed the House in favor of the bill, and Mr. Brown of New York in opposition.—when Mr. White of Kentucky obtained the floor, and the House adjourned.—On Monday evening, the Administration Party, through Mr. Albert Smith of Maine, proposed the rescinding of the rule of the House, which requires that no rule shall be suspended except by a vote of at least two-thirds of the members present, so far that the House may, at any time, by a vote of a majority of the members present, suspend the rules and orders of the House for the purpose of going into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

On this resolution a variety of proceedings was had, but it was finally adopted by a vote of 119 to 85: The whole scene was turbulent, violent and reflected no credit upon the House.—And yet the only object of the motion was to give the majority their legitimate right to act on the public business, and carry on the affairs of the Government.

On Saturday last, Mr. Rayner, (Whig from N. C.), made a forcible attack on Mr. Montgomery, (Democrat from N. C.), on account of some correspondence in the newspapers, growing out of a published speech in the House.—But after breaking a cane or two, the parties were separated—and Montgomery publishes Rayner in a Card, as having "acted the part of a base coward and unprincipled scoundrel."

RICHMOND MARKETS—JUNE 4, 1840.

Tobacco—Receipts and inspections continue large—prices without any material change. Middling qualities perhaps a shade lower.—We quote Large of good weights \$4 a 4 1/2; Leaf—common \$5 1/2 a 6 1/2; middling \$6 1/2 a 7 1/2; good and fine \$7 1/2 a 11; extra fine, manufacturing qualities \$12 1/2.

WINFREE & WILLIAMSON.